

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/537,250	•	03/28/2000	Anthony John Olivier	U 012693-7 5335		
140	7590	04/07/2004		EXAMINER		
LADAS & 26 WEST 61		ET	NGUYEN, TAM M			
NEW YORK		 -		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				1764		
				DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/537,250	OLIVIER ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. I 36(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	oroved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	.	
10. Other:		Mut D. Walter D. Gril Primary Exam	fin

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/537,250

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation "vacuum" inserted in line 5 of claim 1 raises new issues the would require further consideration and/or search. Therefore, the amendment will not be entered.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument that Ireland is attempting to increase the overall isomer content which would render the wax product non-usable is not persuasive because there is no evidence to indicate that isomers are formed in the distillation step.